

The Examiner argues in the Office action that the inventions listed as Groups I and II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features since the use of deoxypeganine for producing a medicament is disclosed in U.S. Publication No. 2004/0167145 (Opitz, et al.). The Examiner thus concludes that no special technical feature exists because Invention I fails to make a contribution over the prior art due to a corresponding lack of novelty (i.e., the use of deoxypeganine for producing a medicament is already known in the prior art).

The Applicants respectfully respond to the instant restriction requirement, *with traverse*. It is submitted that the subject matter of claims 1 and 7 are based on a single inventive concept, i.e., the treatment of schizophrenic psychoses with deoxypeganine wherein acetylcholinesterase is inhibited as well as monoamine oxidase. The Applicants further submit that it would be clear that the use of a medicament for treating a medical condition, i.e., schizophrenic psychoses, is closely related to the medicament itself or to the use of the active substance for the production of the medicament, respectively. Thus, the production of a medicament and its use are inevitably and clearly based on a single inventive concept.

The Applicants still further submit that Opitz, et al. teach an ingredient combination for the treatment of nicotine dependency comprising at least a modulator of the cholinergic system (e.g., galanthamine or deoxypeganine) and one substance modulating the opioid system (emphasis added). Thus, no use of galanthamine alone for the production of a medicament for the treatment of schizophrenic psychoses is taught or disclosed by Opitz, et al. The presently claimed invention is thus new and inventive with

respect to the teachings of Opitz, et al.

The Applicants hereby elect the claims of Group II (which reads on claims 7-15, 18-20 and 23-24, drawn to the use of deoxypeganine for treating a schizophrenic psychosis) for further prosecution on the merits thereof.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned if there are any remaining issues to be discussed which could expedite the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 20, 2009

By: 

D. Peter Hochberg  
Reg. No. 24,603

D. Peter Hochberg Co., L.P.A.  
1940 E. 6<sup>th</sup> St. - 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Cleveland, OH 44114-2294  
(216) 771-3800

DPH/SM